

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 7 and 12-75 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6 and 8-11 are currently pending in this application.

In an Office Action dated November 1, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noren in view of Bouten et al.

Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. Noren teaches the use of two jets to create opposing slits in spallable material. Although Noren teaches an embodiment wherein two angled jets are at a fixed angle from relatively fixed nozzles, and an alternative wherein the nozzles are relatively movable, all of the teachings of Noren require the use of two jets to create two slits thereby loosening the spallable material between the slits to be removed to form a groove.

In contrast, applicants' invention is directed to making multiple passes with a single abrasive fluidjet at selected angles to create a groove having a selected depth and wall taper. Given Noren's teaching to only produce two slits and rely on spalling of material between the slits, Noren does not teach or suggest to provide a groove having a selected depth and wall taper.

To clarify this distinction, claim 1 has been amended to state that in traversing the abrasive fluidjet across a work-piece to form a groove having a selected depth and wall taper, one or more passes are executed along a desired path for the groove with the abrasive fluidjet oriented at a negative lateral angle, a positive lateral angle, and a zero lateral angle. This method is not taught or suggested in Noren. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over the cited art.

With respect to claim 3, neither Noren nor Bouten teach or suggest to traverse an abrasive fluidjet across a work-piece at a negative or positive lateral angle of between about 2 and about 5 degrees. Claim 3 is therefore patentable over the cited art for this reason, in addition to being allowable for being dependent on claim 1.

With respect to claim 5, neither Bouten nor Noren teach to execute at least one pass with an abrasive fluidjet oriented at a longitudinal angle relative to a direction of traverse. Claim 5 is therefore allowable for this reason.

Application No. 10/602,535
Reply to Office Action dated November 1, 2004

With respect to claims 8-11, applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement that the claimed elements are the result of routine skill in the art. Regardless, claims 8-11 are allowable as being dependent on claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. If questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC



Lorraine Linford
Registration No. 35,939

LL:ad

Enclosure:
Postcard

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

587287_1.DOC